



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/611,656

06/30/2003

Philip T. Mellinger

020375-029210US

1992

20350 7590 08/18/2009
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

ZIA, SYED

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2431

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/611,656	Applicant(s) MELLINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner SYED ZIA	Art Unit 2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to amendments and remarks filed on May 20, 2009.

Claims 1-24 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on May 20, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Applicants argued regarding independent Claims 1, 7, 15, and 11 and stated that the cited Lineman et al. (U. S. Publication No.: 2003/0065942) teaches “*the disclosed software enables a security administrator to create and edit a security policy document (block 70), and this is different from the recitations of claims 1, 12, and 21*”.

This is not found persuasive. The system of cited prior art provides a security policy management method that involves creating security policy document and automatically distributing it to users to verify their degree of compliance with policy. The method also provides a running a policy management program on a computer connected with a network to enable creation of a security policy document and enabling the users to view the created document. The method then involves receiving electronic data relevant to the user compliance with the security policy using policy management program ([0036-0039, and 0078-0096]).

As a result, the system of cited prior art does implement and teaches a risk assessments regarding the security of information maintained by entities on shared networks.

Art Unit: 2431

Applicants clearly have failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts.

The examiner will not interpret to read narrowly the claim language to read exactly from the specification, but will interpret the claim language in the broadest reasonable interpretation in view of the specification. Therefore, the examiner asserts that the system of cited prior arts does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent Claims and subsequent dependent Claims. Accordingly, rejections for claims 1-24 are respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. Applicant amended the claims, previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lineman et al. (U. S. Publication No.: 2003/0065942).

Art Unit: 2431

3. Regarding Claim 1, Lineman teaches and describes a method for implementing a security risk assessment for a merchant entity having connectivity to a shared network, the method comprising: receiving at a host computer system including a processor, from each of a plurality of payment-processing organizations, a set of security requirements defining protocols for implementing commercial transactions over the shared network using instruments identified with the payment-processing organization; developing, with the processor at the computer system a security test scheme having a set of test requirements whose satisfaction by the merchant entity is sufficient to ensure compliance with the sets of security requirements defined by each of the plurality of payment-processing organizations; and performing a remote scan of a network site maintained by the merchant entity on the shared network in support of shared-network commercial transactions with a security compliance authority server by the computer system, the remote scan implementing at least a subset of the set of test requirements to evaluate compliance by the merchant entity ([0036-0039, and 0078-0096]).

4. Regarding Claim 12, Lineman teaches and describes a method for assessing a security risk for a merchant entity having connectivity to a shared network, the method comprising: receiving, a host computer system including a processor information describing characteristics of the merchant entity from the merchant entity; determining a host computer system including the processor which test requirements of a security test scheme to use in assessing the security risk for the merchant entity, wherein the security test scheme includes a set of test requirements whose satisfaction by the merchant entity is sufficient to ensure compliance with a plurality of sets of security requirements defined by a plurality of payment-processing organizations; and

Art Unit: 2431

executing the security test scheme with a security compliance authority server in accordance with the determined test requirements ([0036-0039, and 0078-0096]).

5. Regarding Claim 21, Lineman teaches and describes a computer-readable storage medium having a computer-readable program embodied therein for direction operation of a security compliance authority server including a communications system, a processor, and a storage device, wherein the computer-readable program includes instructions for operating the security compliance authority server to assess a security risk for an merchant entity having connectivity to a shared network in accordance with the following: receiving, with the communications system, information describing characteristics of the merchant entity; determining, with the processor, which test requirements of a security test scheme to use in assessing the security risk for the merchant entity, wherein the security test scheme is stored on the storage device and includes a set of test requirements whose satisfaction by the merchant entity is sufficient to ensure compliance with a plurality of sets of security requirements defined by a plurality of payment-processing organizations; and executing, with the processor, the security test scheme in accordance with the determined test requirements ([0036-0039, and 0078-0096]).

6. Claims 2-11, 13-20, and 22-24 are rejected applied as above rejecting Claims 1, 12, and 21. Furthermore, Lineman teach and describe a method and apparatus for establishing a security policy wherein:

Art Unit: 2431

As per Claim 2, further comprising transmitting a questionnaire to the merchant entity with the security compliance authority server, the questionnaire including queries whose truthful response identifies a level of compliance with at least some of the test requirements ([0084-0086]).

As per Claim 3, further comprising scheduling an on-site audit at the merchant entity with the security compliance authority server, the on-site audit being structured to follow a prescribed methodology for identifying a level of compliance with at least some of the test requirements ([0084-0088]).

As per Claim 4, a satisfaction level of the test requirements required for compliance with the test requirements is dependent on a characteristic of the merchant entity ([0087-0091]).

As per Claim 5, the characteristic comprises a shared-network transaction volume processed by the merchant entity over the shared network ([0090]).

As per Claim 6, a frequency of performing the remote scan is dependent on a characteristic of the merchant entity ([0093-0094]).

As per Claim 7, the characteristic comprises a shared-network transaction volume processed by the merchant entity over the shared network ([0090]).

As per Claim 8, further comprising receiving information describing characteristics of the merchant entity from the merchant entity at the host computer system to limit parameters of the remote scan ([0092-0094]).

As per Claim 9, further comprising generating a report at the host computer system summarizing a level of compliance by the merchant entity with the set of test requirements as determined from performing the remote scan ([0083-0096]).

Art Unit: 2431

As per Claim 10, the merchant entity comprises an Internet merchant ([0025-0029]).

As per Claim 11. The method recited in claim 1 wherein the merchant entity comprises an Internet merchant gateway ([0025-0029]).

As per Claim 13, executing the security test scheme comprises performing a remote scan of a network site maintained by the merchant entity on the shared network in support of shared-network commercial transactions with the security compliance authority server ([0078-0088]).

As per Claim 14, executing the security test scheme comprises scheduling an on-site audit at the merchant entity with the security compliance authority server, the on-site audit being structured to follow a prescribed methodology for identifying a level of compliance with at least some of the test requirements ([0078-0088]).

As per Claim 15, executing the security test scheme comprises transmitting a questionnaire from the host computer system to the merchant entity with the security compliance authority server, the questionnaire including queries whose truthful response identifies a level of compliance with at least some of the test requirements ([0078-0088]).

As per Claim 16, determining which test requirements of the security test scheme to use in assessing the security risk for the merchant entity is dependent on a characteristic of the merchant entity ([0087-0091]).

As per Claim 17, the characteristic comprises a shared-network transaction volume processed by the merchant entity over the shared network ([0088-0090]).

As per Claim 18, further comprising generating a report at the host computer system summarizing a level of compliance by the merchant entity with the set of determined test requirements as evaluated from executing the security test scheme ([0072-0091]).

Art Unit: 2431

As per Claim 19, the merchant entity comprises an Internet merchant ([0025-0029]).

As per Claim 20, the merchant entity comprises an Internet merchant gateway ([0025-0029]).

As per Claim 22, the instructions for executing the security test scheme comprise instructions for performing a remote scan of a network site maintained by the merchant entity on the shared network in support of shared-network commercial transactions ([0072-0091]).

As per Claim 23, the instructions for executing the security test scheme comprise instructions for scheduling an on-site audit at the merchant entity ([0072-0091]).

As per Claim 24, the instructions for executing the security test scheme comprise instructions for transmitting a questionnaire to the merchant entity ([0072-0091]).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2431

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SYED ZIA whose telephone number is (571)272-3798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SZ

August 12, 2009

/Syed Zia/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431